Attachment to Independent Case Review Report
For CDRU # 862 Case file # 95-290397 .

Material Examiner: Malone (RQ)

Remarks:

Case resulted in a guilty plea, no testimony transcript.

INDEPENDENT CASE REVIEW REPORT

Independent Review conducted by: Steve Robertson

Area(s) of Expertise: Hair and Fiber

Review commenced at: 11:00 AM (Time), 10/22/02 (Date)

File #: 95-290397

Laboratory #(s): 00403063
00404002

Examiner(s) & Symbols

	Reviewed	Not Reviewed		Reviewed	Not Reviewed
RQ	X	☐		☐	☐
ZE	☐	X		☐	☐
	☐	☐		☐	☐

Materials Reviewed

Trial testimony transcript(s) of: Not available, guilty plea

Testimony Date(s): Pages:

Laboratory Report(s):

Laboratory Number: 00403063, 00404002 Date: Sept. 17, 1990
Laboratory Number: Date:
Laboratory Number: Date:

Examiner Bench Notes of: RQ and unknown technician(s)
Laboratory Number: 00403063, 00404002

Initials: SMH

CRM - 2440

Was any other material reviewed? X Yes ☐ No

If yes, please identify and/or describe the material: Submitting agency letter dated April 2, 1990

Results of Review

File #: 95-290397 Item or Specimen # Reviewed: Q1-Q18, K2, K3, K8, K10

Review of Laboratory Report(s) and Bench Notes:

Note: Numbered comments are required below or on additional pages for any "No" or "Unable to Determine" Responses

1) Did the examiner perform the appropriate tests in a scientifically acceptable manner, based on the methods, protocols, and analytic techniques available at the time of the original examination(s)?
☐ Yes ☐ No X Unable to Determine

2) Are the examination results set forth in the laboratory report(s) supported and adequately documented in the bench notes? ☐ Yes X No ☐ Unable to Determine

Review of Testimony:

Note: Numbered comments are required below or on additional pages for any "No" or "Unable to Determine" Responses

X Transcript not available.

3) Testimony consistent with the laboratory report(s)? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine

4) Testimony consistent with the bench notes? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine

5) Testimony within bounds of examiner's expertise? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine

Initials: SMA

Comments

(Set forth by above question #, if applicable.
Use "Additional Comments" Sheet, if needed)

File #: 95-290397

#1. It cannot be determined from the notes if the tests were performed in a scientifically acceptable manner. Please note that the hair comparison was apparently confirmed by a second examiner.

#2. The results are not adequately documented in the notes. The notes are not dated, are in pencil instead of ink and use abbreviations difficult to interpret. The length and the number of hair examined is not documented. There appears to be transcription errors within the notes. The notes indicate that the pubic hair in items Q6A, Q6C, Q6E, Q6G, Q6I and Q6K were compared to K3, the victim's head hair. The notes also indicate that the head hair in Q6A, Q6B, Q6C, Q6D, Q6E, Q6F, Q6G, Q6H, Q6J and Q6K were compared to K2, the victim's pubic hair. The comparison of these hairs do not appear to be significant to this offense and were not reported.

Review completed at: 11:45 AM (Time), 10/22/02 (Date)

Total time spent conducting review (to nearest 1/4 hour): 0.75 hrs.

I hereby certify that I conducted this review in an independent, unbiased manner and that the results of my review are fully documented on this report consisting of a total of 3 pages.

Steve Roberts — (Signature)

Oct. 22, 202 — (Date)

Initials: SR